

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following explanations and remarks.

On page 2, paragraph 4, of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine et al (U.S. 5,720,438) in view of Pearson (U.S. 4,884,756).

On page 3, paragraph 5, of the Office Action, claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine et al (U.S. 5,720,438) and Pearson (U.S. 4,884,756), and further in view of Buehler et al (U.S. 5,364,589).

On page 4, paragraph 6, of the Office Action, claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims was deemed to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner pointed out that Devine et al fails to teach or suggest connecting the exhaust to all of the grinding and grating means, the upwardly inclined screw conveyor, and the vertical screw conveyor.


Rather than rewrite provisionally allowable claim 11 in independent form, base claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of provisionally allowable claim 11 and intervening claim 10. Base claim 8 is now the same as claim 11 written in independent form including the limitations of the intervening claim, and should now be an allowable base claim. Claims 12 - 17 now depend from an allowable base claim and should be allowable along with base claim 8.

Base claim 1 has also been amended to include the features and limitations of provisionally allowable claim 11, which were deemed to be allowable by the Examiner, but written in method claim form, and should now be an allowable base claim. Claims 2 – 5 now depend from an allowable base claim and should be allowable along with base claim 1.

Further discussion of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on the Devine et al, Pearson, and Buehler et al references is believed to be moot since the claims now contain subject matter deemed to be allowable and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments, explanations and remarks it is respectfully requested that amended claims 1-5, 8 and 12 – 17 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth A. Roddy  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration No. 31,294

December 21, 2004

2916 West T. C. Jester Blvd.  
Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77018  
(713) 686-7676